

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the drawings filed on August 4, 2003.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim to foreign priority and for confirming that the certified copy of the priority document was received.

Claims 1-4 are claims pending in this application.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van der Gracht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,198).

The Applicants traverse the rejection and request reconsideration

Rejections based on Prior Art

All the claims have been rejected based on Van der Gracht.

The present invention relates to holographic spectacles. In a conventional computer-aided Fourier transform hologram with patterns recorded in it the diffraction efficiency reaches almost 100% for a given wavelength. However a zero-order transmission light reaches the viewers' eye without being diffracted because phase conditions are not satisfied at other wavelengths. Such a zero-order light is seen as a spot at the center of a reconstructed pattern posing an obstacle to viewing.

The present invention overcomes the above problem. The present invention has an image pattern reconstructed at the given wavelength recorded in such a way that the image pattern overlaps the center of the reconstruction image area.

Van der Gracht has been cited extensively in the Specification by the Applicants. The Applicants discuss the specific problem of having the zero-order light showing up in the center

of the reconstructed image area. As a result, the present invention has a light portion of the reconstructed image pattern overlapping the center of the reconstruction image pattern.

The Examiner refers to Fig. 2b in support of his contention that Van der Gracht suggests this limitation. Clearly, Van der Gracht does not identify the problem noted in the present Application **nor is there a specific teaching that the light portion of the reconstruction image pattern overlaps the center of the reconstruction image pattern.** The Examiner simply relies on a figure and alleges that the teaching related to light portion of reconstruction image pattern overlapping the center of the pattern is suggested.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Fig. 2b (nor any other sections of Van der Gracht) does not specifically suggest the above mentioned feature.

New Claims

The Applicant respectfully include a new set of claims 5-9 for examination. In these claims, it is recited that the light portion of the reconstruction image pattern overlaps a spot created by a zero order light being transmitted.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No.: 10/632,830

Attorney Docket No.: Q76819

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Chid S. Iyer
Registration No. 43,355

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 16, 2004